POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON TOWN OF LA CENTER, PCHB No. 85-59 Appellant, FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,

IN THE MATTER OF

٧.

Respondent.

THIS MATTER, the appeal of a \$250 civil penalty and citation for allowing overflow of raw sewage from a municipal treatment plant, came on for hearing before the Board at its hearing room in Lacey on September 17, 1985. Seated for and as the Board were Lawrence Faulk, Wick Dufford, and Gayle Rothrock (presiding). The matter was reported by Bibi Carter, court reporter. Respondent agency elected a formal hearing.

BEFORE THE

Appellant town was represented by its mayor, C.R. "Skip" Carlson. Respondent WDOE was represented by Assistant Attorney General Jay J. Manning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were admitted and Argument was heard. From the testimony, evidence, and contentions of the parties the Board makes these

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

LaCenter is a town in Clark County which has been under a building moritorium since 1979 and has embarked on a program - in fits and starts - of expansion and upgrading of its municipal sewage treatment This has involved application of new technology, a plant (STP). grants-in-aid exercise, construction contracting and monitoring, and securing new trained personnel. It is acknowledged that such an endeavor can be quite an undertaking for a small town.

ΙÏ

The Washington State Department of Ecology (WDOE) is an agency authorized to implement the water pollution control statutes and, in that capacity, to monitor the treatment and disposal of municipal and industrial sewage in this state. This may include dispensing federal and state funds to assist with upgrading and dispensing engineering advice through periodic reviews during design and construction phases of any particular project.

III

The Town of LaCenter has an agreement with Clark County Public Works to provide analytical services and a certified operator to oversee the STP and process control adjustments. Clark personnel spend approximately one hour per day at the LaCenter STP

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-59

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 26

performing these duties. The daily cleaning and maintenance duties remain the responsibility of Twon staff.

As referenced earlier, the Town is also in the construction phase of a WDOE grant-funded facility upgrade project. As part of the project design, an influent screen was installed at the headworks for solids removal. It is the town's responsibility to keep the screen cleaned and because of inadequate attention to this requirement, the effluent overflowed onto the ground on two documented occasions preceding the event under appeal; the weekend of October 27, 1984 and the weekend of December 15, 1984.

At all times relevent to this case, the Town's operation of its treatment plant was subject to the terms and conditions of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Waste Discharge Permit (No. WA-002323-0) issued to it by WDOE.

IV

On October 29, 1984 a WDOE inspector visited the town's STP, which had no operator on duty, and observed problems with maintenance ("housekeeping") at the facility, including the presence of floatable solids in the clarifier, the flowmeter script chart being out of paper, and errant sewage on the ground requiring cleanup, disinfection, and disposal. He also observed problems with the influent screen, including difficulty handling surge flow whenever the pump activates, overflowing of the screen and incorrect ultimate disposal of screening wastes, and inadequate cleaning of the screen. Raw sewage was on the plant grounds and, at a slow pace, making its

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-59

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

way to the fence and beyond.

Following this visit the inspector wrote the town's mayor to note these problems and issue two points of advise and make one request for remedy and a report, as noted here:

You are advised to contact Mr. Duane Blunt, Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) Project Engineer, to resolve the issues concerning the influent screen unit.

In addition, my inspection showed an obvious lack of house cleaning and general maintenance. It is ny understanding that Clark County employees show up for one hour per day to collect samples for analytical purposes and to make necessary process control adjustments only. Their responsibilities do not include daily testing, cleaning, maintenance, and repair. There is a definite need for additional man-hours to be spent at the plant performing these general duties.

Therefore, the Town of LaCenter is requested to resolve this issue within ten days from the date of this letter and submit a report to this office identifying steps taken to correct the problem.

V

At the town's request, a meeting was held on December 14, 1984 between the Town and WDOE. The ultimate disposal of screened solids was identified as a problem as well as general attention to operation of the plant on an on-going basis. The Town agreed to submit an operation and solids disposal plan for the screened solids by January 15, 1985. For the interim, WDOE orally granted the town's request to bypass the screen. The Town further agreed to submit a status report on hiring a new operator by January 1, 1985.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-59

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-59

On the weekend of December 15, 1984, another overflow occurred due to clogging at the influent screen. Notwithstanding the agreement to allow bypassing (or removing) the screen, it was still in place on this occasion.

VII

On December 24, 1984 the town again experienced a raw sewage overflow onto the ground at the STP. At this time the influent screen still had not been removed. The cause was screen clogging as with the prior overflows.

The matter was reported to DOE on December 27, 1984, by the county employee performing services at the plant pursuant to agreement.

DOE's inspector visited to the plant on December 28, 1985, and documented the problem with photographs.

IIIV

The Town's NPDES permit contains numerous conditions of operation. Supplemental Condition S5 (a)(1) of the Town's NPDES permit states:

In accordance with WAC 173-230, the permittee shall provide an adequate operating staff which is qualified to carry out the operation, maintenance and testing activities required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this permit. An operator certified for a Class II plant by the State of Washington shall be in responsible charge of the day-to-day operation of the wastewater treatment plant.

Supplemental Condition S5 (a)(3) reads:

The permittee shall institute an adequate operation and maintenance program for their entire sewage

system. This program shall include such items as sewer cleaning, pump station maintenance and other system maintenance activities. Record are to be kept on all such activities.

General Conditions Gl, G2, and G4 state, in pertinent part:

- Gl All discharges and activities authorized by this permit shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit. The discharge of any pollutant more frequently than or at a level in excess of that authorized by this permit shall constitute a violation of the terms and conditions of this permit.
- G2 The permittee shall at all times maintain in good working order and operate as efficiently as possible all facilities and systems (and related appurtenances) for collection and treatment which are installed or used by the permittee for water pollution control and abatement to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of this permit.
- G4 If, for any reason, the permittee does not comply with or will be unable to comply with any of the discharge limitations or other conditions specified in the permit, the permittee shall, at a minimum, provide the department with the following information:
- a. A description of the nature and cause of noncompliance, including the quantity and quality of any unauthorized waste discharges;
- b. The period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times and/or the anticipated time when the permittee will return to compliance; and
- c. Steps taken or to be taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance.

In addition, the permittee shall take immediate action to stop, contain, and clean up any unauthorized discharges and take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse impacts to waters of the state and correct the problem. The permittee shall notify the department immediately by telephone so that an investigation can be made to

evaluate any resulting impacts and the corrective actions taken to determine if additional action should be taken.

IX

Noting the December 24, 1984 incident and the NPDES permit non-compliance and, further, reflecting on agreements with the town and pledges made by the town in mid-December, for which there were no signs of progress by late January 1985, WDOE staff recommended enforcement action.

Х

On February 8, 1985, Notice of Penalty Incurred and Due No. DE 85-158 assessing a \$250 civil penalty for the sewage overflow event of December 24, 1985, was issued. The notice stated:

This overflow was a result of a lack of operation and maintenance at the facility and the Town's failure to comply with NPDES Waste Discharge Permit No. WA-002323-0, Supplemental Requirements S5 (a)(1) and (3) and General Conditions G1, G2 and G4.

An Application for Relief from Penalty was filed with WDOE citing various political and financial difficulties experienced by the town government. Also noted was an attempt to clean the bar screen and a plugged line on December 24th which resulted in a "flood" of water and raw sewage immediately overflowing the influent screen again. The town submitted change orders to correct the influent screen design problem and argued that it had been ill-advised by WDOE to endorse the failure-prone design when the screen was first secured.

WDOE did not grant relief and so stated in an official notice and letter to the town dated March 12, 1985.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-59

Ţ

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

Feeling aggrieved by these actions the town, on April 8, 1985, addressed an appeal to the Board and the matter was filed on April 16, 1985 and set for hearing under cause number PCHB 85-59.

XII

Any Conclusion of Law which is deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings of Fact, the Board comes to these CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

The Board has jurisdiction over these persons and these matters. Chapters 43.21B and 90.48 RCW

ΙI

RCW 90.48.162 requires municipalities operating sewerage systems to procure waste disposal permits. The NPDES permit issued to LaCenter is an example of such a permit, fulfilling the demands of both state and federal law. RCW 90.48.260. The permit was issued under the authority of RCW 90.48.180.

III

RCW 90.48.144 empowers the Department of Ecology to impose civil penalties, on a strict liability basis. In pertinent part, it reads:

Every person who:

(1) Violates the terms or conditions of a waste discharge permit issued pursuant to RCW 90.48.180 . . . shall incur, in addition to any other penalty as provided by law, a penalty in an amount of up to five thousand dollars a day for every such violation. Each and every such violation shall be

a separate and distinct offense, and in case of a continuing violation, every day's continuance shall be deemed a separate and distinct violation. . . .

IV

We conclude that on December 24, 1984, La Center violated the operation and maintenance provisions of its NPDES permit as stated in conditions 55(a)(1) and (3) and G1, G2 and G4.

Here the Department of Ecology imposed a penalty in order to spur the city to action, after expending considerable time preliminarily trying to get the problem solved by other methods. The purpose of the penalty provision of the statute is primarily to influence behavior and, under the facts, its use appears to have been appropriate here.

In exercising its penalizing discretion, WDOE recognized the financial limitations of the town and imposed a fine which can only be viewed as minimal. All of the permit infractions were, in effect, treated as a single violation, the charge was limited to a single day and the dollar amount was at the lower end of the range of possibilities.

VI

Any Finding of Fact which is deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

From these Conclusions of Law, the Board enters this

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-59

ORDER The civil penalty of \$250 imposed upon the Town of LaCenter is affirmed. POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD FAULK, Chairman

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

PCHB No. 85-59